UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,223	02/06/2001	Justin D. Brown	MICR0201	5730

27792 7590 02/16/2006

RONALD M. ANDERSON
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER	
HOSSAIN, TANIM M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2145	

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/778,223	BROWN, ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tanim Hossain	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 December 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-27, 29-34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by O'Neil (U.S. 6,128,279) in view of Jordan (U.S. 6,438,652).

As per claim 1, O'Neil teaches a method of distributing a processing load in a cluster having a plurality of resources, comprising the steps of designating a first resource as an intake providing a specific type of service for a first session (column 7, line 57 – column 8, line 37); directing a plurality of new client requests for the specific type of service by the cluster to the intake to form a first group of clients, wherein each client in the first group continues to receive the specific type of service only from the first resource for as long as those services are provided (column 7, line 57 – column 8, line 37); determining that a second resource be designated as a new intake, to balance the processing load among the plurality of resources (Abstract; where the request is routed to another network server; column 3, lines 60-63); designating the second resource as the new intake (column 3, lines 62-63); directing successive new client requests for services by the cluster to the new intake to form a second group of clients, wherein each client in

the second group continues to receive services only from the second resource for as long as those services are provided (column 2, lines 57-60; in conjunction with column 4, lines 1-6; column 3, lines 3-4; and column 4, lines 10-13; column 7, line 57 – column 8, line 37). O'Neil does not specifically teach that the first intake provides a message to the cluster identifying the second resource as the intake. Jordan teaches the communication of a server, indicating that it is no longer available to process requests, thus requesting the routing to another server, which constitutes the announcement of intake designation to a second server (column 4, lines 15-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the communication of a message, to indicate that a certain server is no longer the intake server, as taught by Jordan in the system of O'Neil. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that allowing a certain server in use to communicate to the system that it is unavailable for further requests allows for more efficiency in the system, by effectively disallowing overburdening the server. Both inventions are from the same field of endeavor, namely the load balancing of servers.

As per claim 2, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of designating a first resource as an intake comprises the steps of assigning a unique identifier to each resource in the cluster (O'Neil: column 5, lines 45-49; where the decision to process requests in the first server, or to route it to another implies the existence of the assignment of an identifier to discern the differences between the servers); and selecting the resource that will be designated as a function of its identifier (O'Neil: column 5, lines 49-51; where the resource selection takes place between the differently identified servers).

As per claim 4, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of designating a first resource as an intake comprises the steps of calculating a time-out (O'Neil: column 3, lines 42-48; in conjunction with column 7, lines 4-6; and column 4, lines 10-13; where the communication between servers determine whether a certain server is online. If it is not, it will not be designated as an intake, which implies the use of a time-out); and selecting the resource that will be designated as a function of the time-out (O'Neil: column 3, lines 42-48; column 7, lines 4-6; and column 4, lines 10-13).

As per claim 5, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of directing the plurality of new client requests for service to the intake to form the first group of clients comprises the steps of receiving a request for service from a new client, wherein the request is received by a resource other than the intake (O'Neil: column 8, lines 56-61); and directing the client to the intake (O'Neil: column 8, lines 55-56).

As per claim 6, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of directing the plurality of new client requests for service to the intake to form a first group of clients comprises the steps of receiving a request for service from a new client, wherein the request is received by a resource other than the intake (O'Neil: column 8, lines 56-61), and transferring the request for service by the new client to the intake (O'Neil: column 8, lines 64-66).

As per claim 7, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of detecting a termination in a service being provided to a client by one of the plurality of resources (O'Neil: column 7, lines 10-13); determining that the client is requesting a service

from the cluster; and directing the client to a current intake for the service requested by the client (O'Neil: column 4, lines 13-19).

As per claim 8, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining that the second resource be designated comprises the steps of calculating a load value of the first resource (O'Neil: column 6, lines 21-22); comparing the load value to a threshold value (O'Neil: column 6, lines 22-24); and designating the second resource as the new intake, if the load value exceeds the threshold value (O'Neil: column 6, line 21-22; column 7, lines 20-26).

As per claim 10, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of periodically exchanging status messages between the plurality of resources, wherein the step of determining that the second resource be designated occurs if a status message has not been received from the intake within a predetermined period of time (O'Neil: column 3, lines 41-48; and column 4, lines 10-13);

As per claim 11, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the step of designating the second resource as the new intake comprises the step of the second resource assuming the designation as the new intake after the second resource fails to receive the status message from the first resource within the predetermined period of time, said status message identifying the first resource as the intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 41-48; column 4, lines 10-13; where the second resource assumes the server duties when it is discovered that the first resource is offline).

As per claim 12, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of designating the second resource as the new intake comprises the steps of: receiving the intake

message at the plurality of resources in the cluster including the second resource (Jordan: column 4, lines 15-27); and updating a list at each of the plurality of resources in the cluster, said list indicating that the second resource has been designated as the new intake (O'Neil: column 7, line 57 – column 8, line 37).

As per claim 13, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the step of providing a message from the second resource to the plurality of resources in the cluster identifying the second resource as the new intake to confirm that the second resource has accepted its designation as the new intake and to ensure that the plurality of resources are aware of the new intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 34-48).

As per claim 14, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the cluster comprises a plurality of nodes on which the plurality of resources are implemented, and wherein the step of designating the second resource as the new intake comprises the steps of: determining that the second resource and first resource reside on a common node (O'Neil: figure 1; column 5, lines 10-12; where the figure shows multiple servers that are part of a cluster, but not precluded from residing on a common node); updating a list stored on the common node, said list indicating that the second resource is designated as the intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 42-48); and providing a message from the second resource designating the second resource as the intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 42-48).

As per claim 15, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of the first resource providing a data message to the plurality of resources in the cluster, said data message including an identification of the first resource and a load value of the first resource (O'Neil: column 3, lines 45-48).

As per claim 16, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the following steps that are carried out by a client: storing a network address for one resource in the cluster (O'Neil: column 5, lines 13-17); automatically attempting to connect to said one resource at the network address (O'Neil: column 5, lines 17-19); resolving from the cluster a network address for the intake for a service requested by the client; and automatically attempting to connect to the network address for the intake (O'Neil: column 5, lines 13-19).

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 16, as they are machine-readable media for implementing claims 1 and 16.

As per claim 19, O'Neil-Jordan teaches a system for distributing a processing load in a cluster comprising: at least one processor for implementing the cluster, said at least one processor comprising a plurality of resources that provide services to a plurality of clients (O'Neil: column 5, lines 39-42); an interface for coupling said at least one processor to the plurality of clients (O'Neil: column 5, lines 41-42; where the distribution of requests implies the coupling of the processor to the clients); a memory in which a plurality of machine instructions are stored (O'Neil: column 5, lines 27-28, 42-44); said machine instructions, when executed by said at least one processor implementing: a first resource operatively connected to the plurality of clients, said resource being designated as an intake that accepts requests from new clients for a service, and in response thereto, forms a first group of clients that continue to receive services only from the first resource for as long as those services are provided and are needed (O'Neil: column 5, lines 45-49); said first resource determining to designate a second resource from among the plurality of resources as a new intake, the second resource being connected in communication with the first resource (O'Neil: column 5, lines 48-51; the communication

between the resources is implied); designating the second resource as the new intake to accept successive new client requests for service, forming a second group of clients that continue to receive services from the second resource for as long as those services are provided and are needed (O'Neil: column 5, lines 48-51); and providing an intake message from the first resource to the plurality of resources in the cluster identifying the second resource as the intake (Jordan: column 4, lines 15-27).

As per claim 20, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the system of claim 19, wherein the machine instructions further cause a new client request for service to be directed to a resource currently designated as the intake (O'Neil: column 5, lines 45-46; where it is implied that new client requests will be directed to online servers, i.e. those designated as the intake).

As per claim 21, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the system of claim 19, wherein the machine instructions are executed in a plurality of processors (O'Neil: column 5, lines 26-28, 40-42; column 10, line 61 – column 11, line 30).

As per claim 22, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the system of claim 19, wherein a first instance of the machine instructions for load balancing are executed to manage the first resource and a second instance of the machine instructions for load balancing are executed to manage the second resource, said machine instructions causing said first instance to communicate with said second instance, and wherein said first instance of the machine instructions cause the first resource to transfer the intake designation to the second resource (O'Neil: column 5, 45-49; where the existence of code means for the servers to communicate with each other is implied, since this capability exists in O'Neil's invention. In column 3, lines 21-24; the discussion of the requests being transferred implies the transfer of the intake designation. In the event that a

server is overloaded, it has the ability to transfer further incoming requests, and in turn, the intake designation.).

As per claim 23, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the system of claim 19, further comprising a client device having a client processor and a client memory (In column 5, lines 13-19; O'Neil teaches the receiving of requests from a remote location, which includes a client device, such as a computer. In this computer, there inherently exists a processor, and a memory) in which are stored: machine instructions (clients with the capabilities of claim 19 would inherently include machine instructions); a list that includes at least one network address corresponding to at least one resource in the cluster, said machine instructions stored in the client memory causing the client processor to: automatically attempt to connect to said at least one resource using the network address corresponding thereto (O'Neil: column 5, lines 13-19; where the remote location discussed is the client device. For the router to be able to receive a request, the client device would have to be able to locate the corresponding network address to the resource, implying the existence of a list. The existence of machine instructions executing this procedure is inherent); receive from the cluster an intake network address corresponding to a resource designated as the intake for said at least one service (O'Neil: column 5, lines 17-18; where the client inherently receives the network address corresponding to the intake); and automatically attempt to connect to the intake network address (O'Neil: column 5, lines 18-19; where the resolving implies the client's attempt to connect to the intake network address).

As per claim 24, O'Neil-Jordan teaches a method of distributing a processing load among a cluster of nodes, each node providing at least one of a plurality of different types of services, comprising the steps of designating a first instance of a first type of service on a first node as an

intake (figure 4); directing new client requests for said first type of service to the intake to form a first group of clients, wherein each client in the first group continues to receive services only from the first instance on the first node for as long as those services are provided and are needed (O'Neil: figure 4, column 7, lines 57-59; column 8, lines 15-17); determining that a second instance of the first type of service be designated as a new intake for the first type of service (O'Neil: column 8, lines 47-51); designating the second instance as the new intake for the first type of service and providing an intake message from the first node designated as the intake for the first instance to the nodes in the cluster identifying the second instance designated as the new intake for the first type of service (O'Neil: column 8, lines 49-50; Jordan: column 4, lines 15-27); and directing a plurality of successive new client requests for the first type of service to the new intake to form a second group of clients, wherein each client in the second group continues to receive services only from the second resource as long as those services are provided and are needed (O'Neil: column 8, lines 49-50).

As per claim 25, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the step of directing new client requests for said first type of service to the intake to form a first group of clients comprises the steps of receiving from a new client a request for said first type of service, wherein the request is received at a node other than the node on which the intake is designated (column 8, lines 56-58; column 9, lines 2-4); and directing the client to the intake (O'Neil: column 8, line 49).

As per claim 26, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the step of directing a plurality of new client requests for service to the intake to form a first group of clients comprises the steps of receiving from a new client a request for said first type of service, wherein

the request is received at a node other than the node on which the intake is designated (O'Neil: column 8, lines 56-58; column 9, lines 2-4); and transferring the request for service by the new client to the intake (O'Neil: column 8, line 49).

As per claim 27, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the step of determining to designate a second instance as the new intake comprises the steps of calculating a load value for the first node, said load value being normalized to enable a uniform comparison to corresponding load values for the other nodes of the cluster (O'Neil: column 6, lines 21-25; where the rest of column 6 discusses the comparison of load values); comparing the load value for the first node with a threshold value (O'Neil: column 6, lines 21-22); designating the second instance as the new intake if the load value exceeds the threshold value (O'Neil: figures 2A, 2B).

As per claim 29, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, further comprising the step of periodically exchanging status messages between the plurality of nodes, wherein the step of determining that the second resource be designated occurs if a status message has not been received from the intake within a predetermined period of time (O'Neil: column 3, lines 41-48; and column 4, lines 10-13).

As per claim 30, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 29, wherein the step of designating the second instance as the new intake for the first type of service comprises the steps of a second node assuming authority to designate the second instance as the new intake; and automatically selecting the second instance as the new intake from a plurality of instances of the first type of service on the second node after the second node fails to receive the status message from the first instance within a predetermined period of time, said status message identifying the

first service instance as the intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 41-48; and column 4, lines 10-13; column 7, lines 57-58; where the first and second embodiments can be combined in O'Neil's invention.).

As per claim 31, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the step of designating the second instance as the new intake for the first type of service comprises the steps of: receiving the intake message at the nodes in the cluster, including a second node on which the second instance is executing (Jordan: column 4, lines 15-27); and updating a list at the nodes in the cluster, said list indicating that the second instance has been designated as the new intake (O'Neil: column 7, line 57 – column 8, line 37).

As per claim 32, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of providing a message from the second node to the nodes in the cluster, said message identifying the second instance as the new intake to confirm that the second instance has accepted its designation as the new intake and to ensure that the plurality of nodes are aware of the new intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 34-48; where the exchange of load information implies the existence of messages identifying the second resource as the new resource).

As per claim 33, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the step of designating the second instance as the new intake comprises the steps of: determining that the second instance and first instance reside on a common node (O'Neil: figure 1; column 5, lines 10-12; where the figure shows multiple servers that are part of a cluster or node); updating a list stored on the common node, said list indicating that the second instance is designated as the new intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 42-48; where the list is interpreted as the load information transmitted between the servers in the cluster. Storage of this list on the common node is

implied); and providing a message from the common node to the nodes in the cluster, said message identifying the second instance as the intake (O'Neil: column 3, lines 42-48).

As per claim 34, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, further comprising the step of providing a data message from the first node to the plurality of nodes in the cluster, said data message including an identification of the first instance and a load value of the first node (O'Neil: column 3, lines 45-48).

As per claim 36, O'Neil-Jordan teaches a system for distributing a processing load in a cluster of resources comprising means for enabling communication between the resources comprising the cluster (O'Neil: figure 1); means for enabling communication between the resources comprising the cluster and a plurality of clients requesting services from said resources (O'Neil: figures 1 and 5; column 5, lines 57-60; where communication enablement between server and client is implied throughout O'Neil's invention); means for designating a first resource as an intake so that the first resource accepts requests from new clients for a service, and in response thereto, forms a first group of clients that continue to receive services only from the first resource for as long as those services are provided (O'Neil: Abstract; column 4, lines 1-6; where content based routing implies the direction of client requests); means for determining to designate a second resource as a new intake (O'Neil: Abstract); and means for designating a second resource as the new intake so that the second resource begins to accept requests from new clients for the service, and in response thereto, forms a second group of clients that continue to receive services only from the second resource for as long as those services are provided (O'Neil: column 8, lines 9-21).

Claims 3, 9, 28, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil-Jordan in view of Liu (U.S. 5,031,089).

As per claims 3 and 9, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 1, but does not specifically teach the step of designating a first (and a second) resource as an intake comprising the steps of calculating a rating value for each resource in the cluster. Liu teaches this limitation (Abstract; column 7, lines 3-5); and also teaches selecting the resource that will be designated as a function of the rating value (column 7, lines 29-41). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the embodiments of O'Neil-Jordan and Liu, as they are from the same field of endeavor, namely load balancing servers. The motivation for doing so is predicated on the fact that Liu's invention, taught in the system of O'Neil-Jordan, allows intake designations to be distributed based on the abilities of the multiple servers, thus diversifying the O'Neil-Jordan invention.

As per claim 28, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, but does not specifically teach the step of designating the second instance as the new intake for the first type of service comprising the steps of calculating a rating value for each resource in the cluster. Liu teaches this limitation (Abstract; column 7, lines 3-5); and also teaches selecting the resource that will be designated as a function of the rating value (column 7, lines 29-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the embodiments of O'Neil-Jordan and Liu, by the same argument regarding claims 3 and 9.

As per claim 35, O'Neil-Jordan teaches the method of claim 24, but does not specifically teach the method further comprising the step of sending a service message from the first instance to a control process executing on the first node, said service message including a unique

identification of the first instance and operational status parameters of the first instance that the control process uses to calculate a rating value for the first instance and a load value for the node that are used to determine a future intake designation. Liu teaches this limitation (column 7, lines 3-5, 25-27, 30-34; where the information exchanged between nodes, and also information regarding the node's own workload values is an instance of a service message including an identification of the first resource and its status parameters, used to calculate a rating values and load values. Column 7, lines 35-40 discuss the future intake designations based on the rating and load values.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Liu's teaching in the system of O'Neil-Jordan, as they are both from the same field of endeavor, namely the load balancing of resources. The motivation for doing so is predicated on the fact that Liu's invention, taught in the system of O'Neil-Jordan allows for the use of rating values in combination with load values to govern how certain servers will be handled in the future, thus diversifying the O'Neil-Jordan combination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on December 8, 2005 have fully been considered, but are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the O'Neil-Jordan combination does not teach the limitations of claims 1, 19, 24, and 36, and their respective dependent claims. Specifically, Applicant asserts the O'Neil-Jordan combination does not disclose the claimed teaching of an intake message, being broadcasted to the plurality of servers by the original intake server, designating a new

intake server. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In the previously cited column 4, lines 15-27 of Jordan, it is stated that "an overloaded cooperating cache server can identify a less loaded cooperating cache server; and communicate a shift request and a copy of the cached object to the less loaded cooperating cache server...so that so that subsequent requests for the object will not be forwarded. Alternatively, an overloaded cooperating cache server can communicate the shift request to the less loaded cooperating cache server, which then obtains a copy of the object from an originating object server, in response to the shift request." It is therefore taught that the shift request identifies a less-loaded server, as further evidenced by the use of the word "the" in the cited portion, in describing a less-loaded server. This constitutes identification of the server that which will serve as the new intake. A message is sent to the other servers, indicating that the less-loaded server has been chosen as the one servicing new requests. This then constitutes the teaching of an intake message, designating a new and specific server as the new intake, sent out by the original intake. Further support for this teaching may be found in column 9, lines 9-15 and 33-36. In this section, the multicasting of a message indicating that further requests will be routed to a new specific owner is taught. Also, a message indicating a new shared ownership is taught, which, in the event of a shift request message by a first shared owner, new requests will be routed to the second shared owner, and not the first one, which further constitutes another example of Jordan's disclosure of an intake message.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE